

REMARKS

Rejected claims 2, 3, 9 and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 4-8 and 11-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kagawa et al '681. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to these claims as amended herein.

These claims variously recite “the secondary electrical behavior of one or more electronic circuits including electronic components and integrated circuits fed by the power supply, such as electronic components and integrated circuits, is analyzed by temporarily reducing the power supplied” or “means for determining the available power capacity are arranged for analyzing the secondary electrical behavior of one or more of said electronic circuits by temporarily reducing the power supplied.”

In addition, the dependent claims are further limited by such additional recitations as “the voltage or the current supplied by the power supply is reduced in steps,” or “said secondary electrical behavior comprises the resetting or switching to an initial state of one or more of said electronic circuits,” or “said means for determining the available power capacity of the power supply comprises a series circuit of at least one resistor and a controllable semiconductor switching element.”

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed and are not even reasonably suggested by Kagawa et al '681. Specifically, as this reference is understood (including as analyzed by the Examiner), Kagawa et al '681 merely describes the testing of a specific power source of a plurality of power sources connected to a load. This reference operates on the basis that the use of multiple power sources for a single load increases the operating reliability of the electric system (column 1, lines 24-26). Kagawa et al '681 is concerned with detecting that at least one but not all of the plurality of power sources may be defective (column 1, lines 28-30), and is in particular concerned with the fact that in order to correctly monitor a subject power source, it is necessary to avoid influence from other power sources on the state of that subject power source (column 1, lines 43-46). Kagawa et al '681 thus proposes to place the electric system in a power supply state wherein electric power is permitted to be supplied from only the subject power source to be monitored (column 2, lines 16-19). In order to monitor, the system may monitor the subject power source directly, but may also monitor the voltage or current through the load device (column 3, lines 25-30).

In contrast, the secondary behavior of an electric circuit as in the present application is described as the behavior of the operation of an electronic circuit or stimuli to be produced by the electronic circuit in response to the occurrence of a diminished supply of electric power. It is noted that the voltage or current which

is used by the load cannot be identified as resembling the operation of the electronic circuit, nor as a stimulus which is produced by the electronic circuit but rather is the intake of power from the power supply.

In addition, it is noted that Kagawa et al '681 also does not disclose temporarily reducing the voltage or current which is supplied to the electronic circuits. Kagawa et al '681 intends to prevent influence from other power supplies on the subject power supply to be monitored, and the logical solution is to supply power from only the subject power supply to the electronic circuits. This is however different from temporarily reducing the power supply in order to determine whether or not the electronic circuits respond to such a reduction. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4-8 and 11-15 are not anticipated by, but instead are now patentably distinguishable over, Kagawa et al '681.

Claims 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou '320 in view of Kagawa et al '681. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to these claims as amended herein.

These claims depend from amended claim 7 and are submitted to be patentable for that reason and for the additional recited limitations of a transmitter in a tracking and telemetry system being characterized by “means for determining the available power capacity are arranged for analyzing the secondary behavior of

one or more of said electronic circuits by temporarily reducing the power supplied by said power supply to said one or more electronic circuits.”

Although Chou ‘320 pertains to a tracking system, there is no disclosure in this reference as currently understood of any means for determining the available power capacity of a power supply by analyzing a secondary behavior of one or more electronic circuits on temporary reduction of power supplied by such supply. And, as the Examiner correctly notes, Chou ‘320 does not disclose the subject matter of claim 7, and the deficiencies of disclosure of Kagawa et al ‘681 are discussed in the above Remarks. Thus, merely combining these references as proposed by the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* basis, including all recited elements, from which a proper determination of obviousness can be formed. And, it may be further argued that the diagnosis of an auxiliary battery, as disclosed by Kagawa et al ‘681, for an (hybrid) automobile including an internal combustion engine powered source offers no motivation or incentive, or even any instruction for modifying Chou ‘320 as proposed by the Examiner to yield anything resembling Applicant’s claimed invention.

It should be noted that the claimed invention is concerned with the saving of energy consumption by the electronic circuits when testing the capacity of the power supply. In tracking and telemetry systems, in particular in transmitters that may be tagged to a variety of objects or persons, such transmitters and tags are

stand-alone devices the service life of which depends on the available battery capacity.

The operational principle disclosed in Kagawa et al '681 is different from the principle of the claimed invention that is concerned with saving energy consumption. The principles of Kagawa et al '681 are in particular suitable for application in a vehicle wherein the amount of electronic components used is a degree of freedom for the designer. In contrast, a tracking and telemetry system, in particular for stand-alone use, requires the use of as little electronic components as possible to keep the solution and power consumption as small and low as possible.

The claimed invention is concerned with energy consumption in stand-alone tracking and telemetry systems for increasing the service life in particular of the transmitters of such systems. The issues mentioned are not encountered in automotive vehicles since the use of a small amount of energy from the power supply in order to test the power supply of an automotive vehicle can be neglected in view of the overall power usage in the vehicle. This is not the case in stand-alone electronic devices that are dependent upon limited power source, in particular in transmitters of a tracking and telemetry system. Thus, the claims as amended define temporary reduction of power supplied to electronic circuits in order to determine secondary behavior thereof, and are thus patentably

distinguishable over the cited references considered either alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. Dependent claims 16-17 are therefore submitted to be patentable to Applicant.

Favorable consideration is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Jan Vet

Dated: 6/5/06

By: A. C. Smith

Albert C. Smith, Reg. No.: 20,355
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7296
Fax.: (650) 938-5200